

Remarks

I. Introduction

Applicant is in receipt of the Final Office Action dated October 18, 2005. This amendment after is made pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 1.116. Before submitting this Response, the Undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner on November 1, 2005. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview. In the interview, the Undersigned discussed the Examiner's new basis for rejection and the Applicant's grounds for traversing these bases for rejection. After that discussion, the Examiner agreed to consider amendments herein to the claims. On that basis, this Response is being filed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 1.116, placing the application in condition for allowance.

II. Claims 20-28 Are Not Anticipated Under 35 § U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 20-28 are pending in the present application. In the current Office Action, claims 20-28 have been rejected by the Examiner for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) based on five newly cited references. These references are U.S. Patent No. 1,575,848 to Laubach ("Laubach"), U.S. Patent No. 1,834,537 to Shipley ("Shipley"), U.S. Patent No. 2,118,540 to Van Arsdel ("Van Arsdel"), U.S. Patent No. 2,134,020 to Anson ("Anson"), and U.S. Patent No. 2,335,256 to Berzer ("Berzer"). Specifically, the Examiner relied on Van Arsdel and Anson in rejecting claims 20-26, and 28/20; Berzer and Laubach in rejecting claims 20, 27, and 28; and Shipley in rejecting claim 20. Hereinafter, Applicant will demonstrate that the claims 20-28, as amended, place the application in condition for allowance and it should be passed to issue.

Of the five patents, Laubach, Anson, Van Arsdel, and Berzer, among other things, disclose an element that engages the hand of the driver that is disposed outward or inward from the steering wheel rim in the plane across of the face of the steering wheel. As set forth in claims 20-28, the second section of the fatigue-relieving apparatus is disposed outward at an angle to the plane across the face of the steering. This distinguishes claims 20-28 from each of these references.

The remaining reference Shipley is also distinguishable from claims 20-28. Shipley has a knob or handle that is fixed to the steering wheel. The knob or handle extends from the steering wheel and is grasped so that the hand is around the knob or handle. The knob or handle will rotate about its longitudinal axis. The knob or handle is rigidly fixed to the steering wheel and cannot be moved out of interference with the operation of the steering wheel as can the present invention as shown in Figure 4 of the present application. Support for the fact that the knob or handle in Shipley is only contemplated to be a fixed, non-movable attachment of the steering wheel is found at page 2, column 1, lines 15 to 89. At this section of Shipley, it describes the fixing of the knob or handle to the steering wheel and the spinning of the knob or handle in the hand of the driver in this fixed position. If the knob or handle of Shipley was to be moved out of interference as set forth in claims 20-28, it would be contrary to teaching of Shipley and would break the device. As such, Shipley does not anticipate claims 20-28 nor render them obvious.

III. Conclusion

In this Response, Applicant has traversed each of the Examiner's bases for rejecting the pending claims 20-28 for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b). Having traversed each of these bases for rejection, the present application is in condition for allowance. The present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Dated: November 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Wayne M. Kennard
Attorneys for the Applicant

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: 617-526-6183
Fax: 617-526-5000
Attorney Docket Number: 114089.120US2